

## REMARKS

Claims 17-32 remain in the present application. Claims 1-16 were previously canceled. Independent claims 17 and 25 have been amended.

In the Office Action dated August 11, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 17 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner noted that the phrases “and, if appropriate” and “with good probability” render the claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrases are part of the claimed invention.

Pursuant to the present amendment, the above-mentioned phrases in independent claims 17 and 25 have been deleted. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection be withdrawn.

Also in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected, in particular, independent claims 17 and 25 of the present application under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Crockett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,530,091) in view of Hashimoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,286). For at least the following two reasons, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejection and respectfully request the withdrawal thereof.

Pursuant to the claimed invention, the synchronization of the switching computer system is initiated by the at least one main computer. Conversely, the Crockett reference merely teaches a synchronization process which is initiated by a slave processor. Such slave processor transmits a so-called “interrupt packet” to an associated master processor (main computer) for this particular purpose. Since the main computer (master processor) of the claimed invention is that which initiates synchronization, there is no need for such an interrupt packet as required in Crockett. Indeed, the claimed invention incorporates a time synchronization interrupt which enables a synchronous interrupt regarding all associated computers (processors). Such interrupt is inventively used in order to obtain absolute time synchronization between such computers (processors).

Second of all, neither the Crockett nor Hashimoto references teach or suggest the claimed success control for synchronization. Specifically, the claimed invention performs such success control with the assistance of a “success message” wherein the success message, by itself, does

not guarantee a successful synchronization. Only when the main computer receives the success message up to the N-th interrupt does it regard the secondary computer as being synchronized.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the cited references teach or suggest such method as described above and claimed.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Crockett nor Hashimoto references, either alone or in combination with each other, teach or suggest the method for time synchronization of a switching computer system as claimed in the presently-pending claims, as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

It is further submitted that a two month extension of time of \$450.00 is due in connection with this response at this time. However, if any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Examiner is authorized to deduct said fees from Deposit Account No.: 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (0112740-253) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

William E. Vaughan

Reg. No. 39,056

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4292

Dated: January 11, 2005